

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-70 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 38, 53, 66, 68, and 70 are currently amended, and such amendments are fully supported by the specification and drawings, at least at page 17, lines 14-31, and Figure 6. For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants assert that all claims are in condition for allowance.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-11, 13-17, 19-28, 30-70 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Simonoff et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,078,322. As set forth in more detail below, the reference fails to describe every element of every claim as required by MPEP § 2131, and therefore the rejection is unsupported by the art. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Independent claims 1, 38, and 53 and dependent claims 66, 68, and 70 recite “supplementing a skeletal UI...with one or more icons, labels or menu items, or combinations thereof.” The *Simonoff* reference fails to disclose this limitation. *Simonoff* describes a Universal Client device that is downloaded to the client host 300, which in turn loads and interprets a GUIScript file, and then displays an appropriate GUI to the user. Col. 8, line 66-Col. 9, line 4; Col. 9, lines 34-38. However, there is no indication in the reference that the GUIScript file or the GUI is anything less than an entire UI displayed to a user. Nowhere does *Simonoff* describe a “skeletal UI,” much less supplementing a “skeletal UI” with icons, labels, or menu items as claimed. The rejection counters, “The GUI objects [of *Simonoff*] themselves are being pushed down from the server to client via GUIScript, thus moving data objects from first memory to second memory is realized.” OA dated 11/18/2004, p. 16. However, the *Simonoff* reference does not describe such GUI objects as being skeletal nor supplementing the same.

Moreover, independent claims 1, 38, and 53 and dependent claims 66, 68, and 70 further recite that the first memory location—which stores the skeletal UI—and the second memory location—which stores icons, labels, or menu items—are both situated on the client device. The cited reference clearly fails to describe this limitation. Indeed, the rejection concedes that *Simonoff* discloses, “The GUI objects themselves are being pushed down from the server to client via GUIScript, thus moving data objects from first memory to second memory is realized.” *See also*, Col. 9, lines 33-50. The cited reference, which realizes the use of two memory

locations only by pushing an entire GUI object “from the server to client,” is quite distinct from the claimed limitation that requires both memory locations to be situated on the client device.

Next, independent claims 1, 19, 45, 53, and 59 recite populating a native UI control of the client device, which is used by the intermediate UI on the client device, with source data items that are related to the server-based application and that are transmitted from the UI server to the client device. The *Simonoff* reference fails to disclose this limitation. Rather, the cited reference describes loading a GUIscript file that “defines all the display windows and their operation for the application running on the application host 200” and is usable to “display the appropriate GUI to the user.” Col. 9, lines 33-50. There is no description of the GUIscript populating a native UI control as claimed. Instead, the system of *Simonoff* operates by sending messages to the client host 300 that define the GUI in its entirety, not by populating native UI controls. Col. 12, lines 40-45, 49-53. Indeed, the GUIscript that defines the user interface in *Simonoff* contains the totality of the user interface and does not call or populate native UI controls. *See* Col. 13, line 8-Col 14, 56; Figs. 6A-6J, 7, 8A-8C (illustrating entire UI included in GUIscript).

Further, dependent claims 6-8 and 24-26 recite the client device “performing an offline action...while said client device is disconnected from said UI server” and then “subsequently establishing a session between said client device and said UI server; and thereafter transmitting...a command indicative of said offline action” from the client device to the UI server. Nowhere does the *Simonoff* reference disclose this limitation of (1) performing an offline action, (2) subsequently establishing a session between the client and server, and (3) thereafter transmitting to the server a command indicative of the offline action. The only mention the reference makes to offline actions entails a discussion of a client host operating when not connected to a server host. Col. 10, lines 23-30. However, this discussion merely indicates that the client host may display audio and video clips or timed GUIscripts, “provided that [these items] were available to the...client host 300.” The only description in *Simonoff* of establishing a connection between the client and the server is entirely unrelated to this discussion of displaying audio and video clips, and it fails to describe that such connection is subsequent to the offline action. Additionally, the description of establishing a client-server connection similarly fails to describe that a command indicative of the offline action is thereafter transmitted to the server action as claimed. *See e.g.*, Col. 9, lines 32-50; Col. 10, lines 34-48 (the portions of the reference cited by Examiner, but which fail to describe establishing a subsequent session or

thereafter transmitting a command indicative of the offline action to the server). The cited reference's discussion of offline operation and establishing a client-server connection are entirely unrelated and fail to anticipate the three distinct steps of claims 6 and 24.

Finally, independent claims 1 and 38 and dependent claims 66, 68, and 70 additionally recite generating, with a client device, a user interface for a server-based application where the "UI format [is] determined by a UI server." The *Simonoff* reference fails to disclose this limitation. In contrast, it is the web browser on the client host 300 of *Simonoff*, not the server, that identifies which Universal Client device to download from the server host 100. Col. 8, line 66-Col. 9, line 4. Moreover, rather than a UI server determining the UI format as claimed, the Universal Client device on client host 300 of *Simonoff* determines the UI format by interpreting a GUIScript file that defines the display windows and their operation. Col. 9, lines 34-37.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claims 1-11, 13-17, 19-28, 30-70 are in condition for allowance.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 12, 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Simonoff* et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,078,322 in view of *Dillingham*, U.S. Patent No. 6,327,608. Neither *Simonoff* nor *Dillingham*, nor the combination thereof, teach or suggest all of the limitations of claims 12 or 29. Claims 12 and 29 are allowable as being dependent from claims 1 and 19, respectively, for the reasons set forth above.

Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Simonoff* et al. U.S. Patent No. 078,322 in view of Office Notice. Neither *Simonoff* nor the Official Notice, nor the combination thereof, teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 18. Claim 18 is allowable as being dependent from claim 1 for the reasons set forth above.

This application now stands in allowable form and reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP  
**Customer Number 25763**

Date: March 23, 2005

By: Christopher R. Hilberg  
Christopher R. Hilberg, Reg. No. 48,740  
Intellectual Property Department  
Suite 1500  
50 South Sixth Street  
Minneapolis, MN 55402-1498  
(612) 492-6694